

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sakakibara et al. (US, 6,007,928).

Claims 8 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 7 and 11 are amended to clarify the antecedent basis issues raised in the Office Action. Claims 14-26 stand withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 1-26 are presently pending in the application with claims 1-13 presented for further consideration.

All Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 8 and 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant amends dependent claim 7 to depend from claim 3, as suggested by the Examiner to only clarify the antecedent basis issue raised in the Office Action. Claim 8, as originally presented, depends from claim 7. Accordingly, the antecedent basis for dependent claim 8 is properly provided by the amended claim 7. In addition, Applicant amends dependent claim 11 to only clarify the antecedent basis issue.

As to rejection of claims 10, 12, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as originally presented, recites, in part, “an organic emission layer having a blended structure of a block copolymer and an organic emission material” (Emphasis added). Since dependent claims 10 and 12 depend from independent claim 1, there is proper antecedent basis for “the blended structure” recited in claims

10 and 12. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8 and 10-13 complies with the antecedent basis requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and respectfully requests that rejection of claims 8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b)

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Sakakibara et al. (US, 6,007,928). Applicant traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that Sakakibara et al. fails to teach or suggest at least an organic emission layer having a blended structure of a block copolymer and an organic emission material. The Office Action on page 3 alleges that “Sakakibara et al. discloses an organic EL device including: first and second electrodes (ITD film 2 alleged to be the first electrode, aluminum film 4 alleged to be the second electrode, FIG. 1) over a substrate; and an organic emission layer (light-emitting layer 3 alleged to be the organic emission layer, FIG. 1) between the first and second electrodes, and having a blended structure of a block copolymer and an organic polymer emission material (col. 2, line 45, col. 4 lines 5-15, col. 4, lines 19-24, col. 5, lines 22-30, col. 6, lines 13-39, col. 7, lines 19-28, and Table 1).” Applicant disagrees.

Sakakibara et al. teaches a light-emitting layer having only a block copolymer. For example, Sakakibara et al. discloses seven (7) different block copolymers (five (5) block copolymers are prepared in accordance with the recipe shown in Table 1 and two (2) block copolymers are prepared in accordance with different recipe (col. 6, line 65 to col. 8, line 26), such that the resultant seven polymers have only two block components. However, all of the

Sakakibara et al.'s examples use only a block copolymer as the light emitting layer 3. Thus, Sakakibara et al. does not teach or even suggest at least "an organic emission layer having a blended structure of a block copolymer and an organic emission material." Accordingly, Sakakibara et al. fails to teach or suggest every feature of independent claim 1, and thus Sakakibara et al. fails to anticipate at least independent claim 1. As claims 2-13 depend from claim 1, thereby incorporating all the limitations of claim 1, Sakakibara et al. fails to teach or suggest every feature of claims 2-13 for at least the reasons explained above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) be withdrawn.

As to claims 3-13, the Office dismisses the claimed features as being recited in a product-by-process format and therefore alleges that the claimed features are not given any patentable weight. Although Applicant disagrees, since Sakakibara et al. fails to anticipate claim 1 for at least the reasons stated above, Sakakibara et al. fails to anticipate claims 2-13 for at least the same reasons. Hence, Applicant respectfully asserts that the arguments with regard to claims 3-13 under the product-by-process analysis are moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, withdrawal of all rejections, and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: April 24, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001

By: 

Kyle J. Choi
Reg. No. 41,480